

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/9926

21 August 1981

# Near East/North Africa Report

(FOUO 29/81)



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF  
MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION  
OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/9926

21 August 1981

## NEAR EAST/NORTH AFRICA REPORT

(FOUO 29/81)

### CONTENTS

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Document Reveals Symposium With Egypt  
(AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI, 3-9 Jul 81) ..... 1

#### INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

- Stepped Up Technological Development Urged  
(Nabil Maghribi; AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI, 2 Jul 81) ..... 1

#### AFGHANISTAN

- 'MATCH' Cites Soviet Troops Quandary  
(Patrick Forestier; PARIS MATCH, 17 Jul 81) ..... 12

#### ALGERIA

- FLN Party Positions Following Meeting of Central Committee  
(MARCHES TROPICAUX ET MEDITERRANEENS, 24 Jul 81) ..... 16

#### IRAN

- Bani-Sadr Gives Reasons for Flight  
(Abolhasan Bani-Sadr; PARIS MATCH, 14 Aug 81) ..... 19
- Bani-Sadr Claims Support of 90 Percent of Armed Forces  
(Jamal Rasheed; THE OBSERVER, 9 Aug 81) ..... 22
- Former Envoy Rajavi Views Iranian Situation  
(Qasem Rajavi Interview; LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR, 25-31 Jul 81) 24

- a -

[III - NE & A - 121 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DOCUMENT REVEALS SYMPOSIUM WITH EGYPT

Paris AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI in Arabic No 229, 3-9 Jul 81 pp 22-24

/Article: "Unpublished Religious Dialogue Between Egypt and Israel"

/Text/ Sadat Is Preparing to Introduce a Bill Which Would Make It a Crime for Egyptians to Boycott Israelis.

The most dangerous thing in the Egyptian-Israeli peace plan is that it is attempting to leap back 3,000 years and draw upon ancient Egyptian history in order to "be philisophical" concerning the usurpation of Arab and Palestinian rights--in the name of peace. AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI has obtained a very significant Egyptian-Israeli document which reveals what has not yet been made public concerning Zionist demands after Camp David. Perhaps the most ominous thing which the document reveals is the appeal to the rulers of Egypt to intervene in order to change the Glorious Koran's view of the Jews. The document, which came to us from its original source, is a literal transcript of a dialogue which took place between a group of educated people and university intellectuals from both Egypt and Israel concerning how to consolidate "peace relations" between the two regimes and two peoples. One was struck not only by the content of the document, but also by the level of participation on which the dialogue took place. Israel was represented by academic people and university professors, whereas Egypt was represented by two Egyptian government leaders--Dr Mustafa Khalil and Dr Butrus Ghali--and there was no participation by any of the academic people from any of Egypt's 16 universities.

AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI has learned that President Sadat reviewed the contents of this document with Menachem Begin during his last meeting with him at Sharm al-Shaykh. The discussion ended with the reaching of an understanding in principle that the Egyptian government would submit to the People's Assembly a bill which would make it a crime for any Egyptian citizen--in any field--to refuse to deal with an Israeli citizen merely because he is an Israeli. The basis of the bill is that such a refusal is "a racist crime which is inimical to the Egyptian-Israeli peace." After the meeting Sadat entrusted a committee, chaired by his vice-president Mr Husni Mubarak, with the job of preparing this bill. Preparation of the bill was to take place in total secrecy till the opportunity came to publish it /as a law/, if necessary, during a secret session of the People's Assembly. Here is the entire text of the document:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The symposium was held in the University of Tel Aviv on 19 December 1980. It had been decided to publish the proceedings of the symposium in the Egyptian magazine OCTOBER as well as in one of the Israeli newspapers. However, Menachem Begin issued a decision which, at the last minute, kept the dialogue from being published because it contained, in his opinion, "vestiges of racism against Israel."

Those who participated in the Israeli group were Prof Chaim Ben Shazar (dean of the University of Tel Aviv), Prof Shimon Shamir (professor of Middle Eastern history), Prof David Vital (professor of political science), Prof Tsvi (Yafot) (professor of history), Prof Yoran Dinstein (lecturer at the university), and Prof Sason Somekh (professor of Arabic literature). The dialogue was opened by Prof Ben Shazar.

[Prof Ben Shazar] A university is a center of thought, contemplation, and planning for the future for the sake of achieving progress for society. A group of scientists and academic people in our university have begun to think about peace and about the repercussions it will have for Israel and for the Middle East area in general. They are doing this at a time when the [Arab-Israeli] conflict has been absorbing all of the wealth and capacities of our country. If we see them today undertaking and participating in this symposium, without being affected by the escalation and oscillation of events which take place on the political level, then this is because of what I have already mentioned in the context of this introduction.

I suggest that we utilize this occasion, with prominent guests from our neighboring country of Egypt visiting us today, to talk not about political matters, which are being negotiated by politicians, but about matters which concern us and about the repercussions which these matters will have on us in the long run--repercussions which, in the distant future, will in turn have their effect on the most important events and developments which have been taking place since President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem about 2 years ago. I call upon Prof Shamir to open our discussion.

[Prof Shimon Shamir] I cannot resist the temptation to begin by talking about myself. For 15 years I have been teaching Egyptian history at this university. During this time I have tried to instill in our students a love for Egyptian history, respect for the culture of the Egyptians, and [a desire to] discuss peace between Egypt and Israel. This was at a time when such discussion was resented. No doubt you can understand what my feelings are when I welcome this delegation of Egyptians here and when I see that we are having a meeting with personalities who represent a high level of science and knowledge.

In addition to this, it is, without doubt, an opportunity for us to reciprocate the friendly reception which many of us received from our Egyptian colleagues during our visit to Egypt. Let us show them the courtesy that they have shown us.

Disappointment

I would like to bring up a matter which I feel deserves some attention. I believe that we are able to realize why Egypt's own interests have justified the peace initiative. Such interests are the most important firm and legitimate reason why a person wants to achieve peace. And it is necessary to make sure that one guards such interests while on the path toward peace. And if we want to transform our government's political decision into actual peace, then we must consolidate relations between our two peoples on both the social and cultural levels in our two societies.

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In order to do this, we must exchange opinions and we must communicate our concepts to each other. We must understand each other better than we have done in the past. I personally am worried about our situation as it stands now. We have expended a lot of effort in this direction and in this field, but still the results which we have achieved are meager.

During my visits to Egypt I was very disappointed when I discovered that the Egyptians are even more ignorant /about the history and culture of the Jews/ than the Israelis are about the history and culture of Egypt. Even nowadays it is impossible for a person to find, in an Egyptian bookstore, books and writings concerning the history, culture, and civilization of the Jews. What one does find is such things as the history of the Jews and what the Koran says about the Jews published in series form and entitled "the Jews and the Koran." These things are widely read by Egyptians and there is no doubt that they do not contribute toward greater understanding between our two peoples.

Undoubtedly positive steps have been taken in this regard. Some of Egypt's leaders, who are politicians and men of culture, have published some of their political and cultural ideas and views, and the Egyptian press has participated in this effort. Some of them--actually a small number of them--have visited Israel. One such person was Dr 'Atiyah from the University of 'Ayn Shams who is a specialist in Hebrew literature. He has been working at our university for several weeks, and he is still with us today. But this is not enough. Peace between Israel and Egypt is not like a peace relationship between two banana republics in Latin America or between tribal states in the middle of Black Africa. Israel and Egypt really do represent something in world history. Furthermore, they have occupied a prominent place on the upper levels of the world's academic history.

The long and ancient history of these two nations goes back more than 35 centuries. Today we must draw upon the lessons and wisdom learned from this long history and utilize this in order to strengthen and consolidate the peace relationship which binds our two peoples together. I hope that you, in your capacity as representatives of the chosen cultural, intellectual, and political elite of your society, will exercise your influence for the purpose of bringing about the achievement of progress in this field.

## Academic Honesty

/Dr Mustafa Khalil/ This is a historic day for all of us because it is on this day that we are planning the formulation of relationships which we hope will be cemented in the future between our universities and the universities of Israel. At the present time we have 16 universities in Egypt, including the University of Al-Azhar which was established 1,000 years ago.

Relations between Egypt and the Jews began, just like you said, 3,000 years ago. Furthermore, the relationship between the Egyptians and the Jews goes back in history more than 2,000 years. /As published/ Nevertheless, I feel that it is necessary to take this opportunity to point out an important difference as long as we are speaking to each other honestly, as academic people. In Egypt, our point of view is that Judaism is one of the three revealed religions. These three religions are Christianity, Islam, and Judaism. Concerning one matter we have a basic difference of opinion with you. When we talk about the Jews, we do not talk about them as a national entity simply because their religion is Judaism. We consider that a Jew can be an Egyptian Jew, a German Jew, a French Jew, etc.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

This concept that I am talking to you about is part of a basic teaching which we believe in. We differentiate totally between religious beliefs and national groupings. Even in our political life, at the present time, we do not accept the idea of having our political leadership linked to or based on our religious convictions. We stress that religion and national sentiment, that is, religious affiliation and nationality, are not the same thing. A person does not need to delve into history in order to prove this fact. Israel existed as a state in the north, and Judah was another state, separate from Israel, during the period when a Jewish nationality first arose. At that time there were other nationalities such as the Edomites in the south who adopted the Jewish religion. There were also the Khazars who adopted Judaism although they were not of Jewish origin. We have always considered that to be Jewish is to have a certain religion and is not to belong to a given national, ethnic entity.

No doubt you in Israel, in the Zionist movement, have a point of view which differs from our point of view in Egypt. I feel that it is my duty to point out our point of view to you in all sincerity and frankness. When we began to talk about peace with Israel, taking into consideration that Israel is our neighbor and that we want our relations with it to be relations of friendship and peace, we had in mind the Israel which includes, at the present time, both Arab citizens and Jewish citizens. We had in mind the Israel which must either change in the future or introduce changes in its present society in a way which is in conformity with its situation, or else it will be forced to face circumstances concerning which nobody can predict the outcome.

In addition to this, we realize the extent to which you adhere to your traditions and to your history, and we have no doubt that you are proud of these things. We share your feeling in such pride because any ancient people which has lived in this region of the world should be proud of its history and of the accomplishments achieved during such a long and venerable history.

We know that Judah, after returning to his homeland from exile in Babylon, consolidated his kingdom during two different periods of independence. One of these two periods was during the regime of the Hittites, and the second period was during a revolt against the Roman Empire. There were some periods during which the Jewish kingdom enjoyed autonomy under Egyptian sovereignty, and at other periods it enjoyed this autonomy under Syrian sovereignty. But today we know that the Jews--or the Hebrews, to express it in more accurate terms--during those years were proud of their independence and proud of their religious convictions. We know that when they were waging battle, they were doing so because of their belief in one god and that for a long time they refused to allow the sanctity of their temples to be violated. We know that you must be very proud of your faith and of your religion which we all respect. And we respect this faith which has made this possible.

Psychological Barrier

In Egypt we Moslems, Christians, and Jews live as a nation which is not divided by creeds nor torn apart by religion. You know that monotheistic faith began in Egypt during the time of Akhenaten. And some scientists have attempted to prove that the name "Moses" was not a Hebrew name, but was an Egyptian name. The father of Moses was a prominent priest of the faith of Akhenaten. This was the group of people who continued to worship one god after his death and who followed Moses to the desert where the temples of their ancestors were located.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

I agree with your opinion that there is a large gap in Egypt which serves to widen the gulf which prevents mutual understanding between our two peoples. It is for this reason that, during the speech which I gave during President Navon's visit to Egypt, I suggested the establishment of a center of Judaic studies which would serve to develop relations and consolidate mutual understanding between our two countries.

The war which has taken place between us has caused us all a lot of damage, and I do not want to discuss this war anymore. The only thing I want to say is--let us forget the past, and let us turn over a new leaf. Before President Sadat's initiative, Egyptians refused to listen to any Israeli point of view and always refused to show any interest in the Jews and their religion. But today things have changed, and mutual understanding has begun to prevail between Egyptians and Israelis. After President Sadat's blessed initiative, we began to read and educate ourselves about your history, traditions, and heritage. A psychological barrier existed, and the initiative has led to its removal.

We want to establish peace in the Middle East on the basis of mutual understanding. And because of this, and in order to achieve this peace, it will be necessary to find a solution to the Palestinian problem in all of its dimensions. I believe that during your discussions this point is the one which should be deserving of your concern.

So now that peace has been achieved it has become possible for us to come to Israel and for us to see each other. We should adopt the principle which aims at developing our relationship and relations between our two countries, and we should proceed with these relations on firm foundations.

/Prof David Vital/ Every society and every nation should be granted the right to define its own nature and entity, whether this nature or entity be based on a definition which is religious, national, political, or even cultural. This society or nation must be free to decide, within reasonable limits, what practices it shall pursue on the basis of principles, customs, and courses of action which it has determined for itself. This is an extremely important matter, and it is not merely a matter of principle or of justice. It is one of those matters which are accepted by both reason and logic. As long as this is true, the matter then becomes a part of university life and practice. If the matter basically depends on this premise, then it is up to the Jewish people to decide whether or not Jews are individuals who are members of a synagogue or whether or not they are a nation, regardless of what this or that expression means.

The fact of the matter is that the Jews have always been Jews, as a nation, since ancient times, and they still are today. As long as all peoples are free in their actions and convictions, whether they be Egyptians, Spaniards, Frenchmen, or Swedes, then the Jewish people should also have the right to be considered by its individuals to be both a national and religious group. In other words, being Jewish means belonging to a certain people, nation, and religion all at the same time.



FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

I am saying this in response to Dr Khalil's remarks in order to spell the words right, and not only to dot the i's and cross the t's. My reply shall be a direct reply. To say that the Jews, as members of a certain religion, do not constitute a nation, and that there are Egyptian Jews, Arab Jews, French Jews, etc., and to speak at great length about this, will lead us into the labyrinths of a long debate. The only thing which I want to say here is that Dr Khalil is wrong in his assessment. I insist that if the national legitimacy of the Jews is brought into question and is rejected by the Arab countries on the basis that being Jewish only means having a certain religion, and if being Jewish consequently means not at all belonging to a certain nation, then I am afraid that there are far fewer basic elements for achieving peace than we in Israel believe that there are. I am afraid that this will serve to maintain the critical situation and level of tension which both prevail in the Middle East.

I believe that real peace and good relations must be determined by principles of equality and principles of mutual recognition, on the part of all parties, of the right to hold convictions, to have freedom, and to possess sovereignty and independence. In order to achieve a comprehensive peace in the area we need to proceed on the basis of these fundamental truths.

/Prof Tsvi (Yavot)/ It was a pleasure for me to listen to Dr Khalil present his splendid narration concerning some of the aspects of the life of Moses. In addition to what he said, I would like to say that Moses, even if he was an Egyptian priest, made a great mistake, in my opinion, when he left Egypt. He could have stayed in Egypt, and if he had done so then all our problems and difficulties would have been solved.

But Moses was forced to leave Egypt, and he was forced to leave his people without shelter and without refuge. Then came Christianity and Islam which were born in the Middle East.

At that time, the Middle East succeeded in exporting its revealed religion to Europe in the form of Christianity. This went on for a number of years. And then, during the religious wars and as a result of them, the blood of the Europeans was intermingled and the Europeans invented nationalism. By means of this contrived slogan, they tried to take revenge on us. They sold this invention of theirs to the Middle East, and because of this the lives of our young people in the Middle East have been wandering astray in national wars. There is no reason to be surprised and perplexed by this.

Any one of us today can see, in European cafes, a young Frenchman sitting together with a young German, both of them wearing American jeans produced by factories owned by Jews. We see them talking with each other in a spirit of mutual understanding and friendship about each one's plans for the future and about the war which had driven Germany and France apart and thus left a feeling of hostility between the individuals of the two nations.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In my opinion, this development could take place between our children and young people in the future. It is possible for this to take place when we succeed in realizing that the Egyptians are unable to break off from their Arab neighbors and that this is their lot. And when they realize that this is true, then they will understand and know that we are a strong people, that we are not merely an isolated nation, and that we do not want to be isolated from our Jewish brethren in the Diaspora.

The difficulty is: What are we going to be able to tell our children, 200 or 300 years from now, when they look at us and ask why we fought each other?

There is only one definition of what anti-Semitism is. The fact is that we are not like you, and you are not like us. But if we do not try to understand each other, then we will never reach the end of the road to peace.

As far as we are concerned, religion and nationality are the same thing. Perhaps this is based on a great mistake which was committed during the reign of King Cyrus when we were on our way back to Babylon. But we are not able to change our history, just as you are not able to be anything other than yourselves.

If you are able to convince your Palestinian friends--those of them who do not go along with Yasir 'Arafat's point of view and who demonstrate that they are ready to allow us to live--that we are also human beings and that our nation and people have the right to exist, then this will make our people in Israel realize and accept the fact that there are people who understand them. This will then open up the door to a mutual dialogue. Since the majority of people in Israel believe that the area which is called Palestine was given this name by Herod, then it is up to this majority of people to find a solution to the nationality problem of these two peoples. If a solution is found to the nationality problem of the two peoples who are inhabiting Palestine, then the other problems will be of secondary concern. Just as your great President Sadat said: "Our two peoples do not need national leaders, they need psychologists."

We are asking you to come to our aid so that we can reach this goal. And only when this happens will our children be able to forgive us for the blood which we have shed during our three wars.

Prof Yoran Dinstein Dr Khalil has made reference to the right of the Palestinian Arabs to self-determination and the need for Israel to recognize the Palestinians. However, in the Camp David agreement Israel did recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people. Furthermore, among the educated elite in Israel there are many people who support the idea of granting the Palestinians their right to self-determination. But the thing which causes anxiety is the fact that, today, we hear Dr Khalil denying the existence of the Jewish people as a nation and defining Jews as members of a Jewish community. So it appears to me that it is the Jewish people who need to be recognized as such--not the Palestinian people. The Jewish people are the ones whose right to self-determination needs to be recognized--not the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people.

What a great tragedy it is for us to see one of the members of Egypt's cultural elite failing to realize this fact.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

During the last few years there has been a balance in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Most of the Arabs have rejected the Jewish people's right to exist as a nation, and most of the Jews have rejected the right of the Palestinian Arab people to exist as a nation.

The strange thing about this contradiction is that each of the two sides has refused to recognize the right of the other side to exist as a nation and to have self-determination. But what is even stranger than all of this is that among Arab thinkers such as Dr Khalil, who is a statesman and a great intellectual, there are those who attempt to impose upon the Jews what they do not want for themselves. We do not conceive of ourselves merely as a religious group. We are also an ethnic group. The sooner Egypt realizes this fact, the more likely we will be to have a stable peace. Furthermore, the peace has been a result of the peace agreement, but the peace agreement is not the last step of the peace process which still remains to be completed.

For this reason, I suggest that meetings continue between the intellectuals of both countries and that these meetings take place in a regular and organized manner so that we can dispense with some of the erroneous and dangerous concepts which Egyptians and Israelis have about each other and thereby achieve mutual understanding.

Books Against the Jews

Prof Sason Somikh I would like to bring up the subject of relations between the two peoples. Last year I visited Egypt in January, and I spent 10 days in Cairo. Because of my reasons for visiting Egypt, which concerned the study of Egyptian culture, I was granted the opportunity to meet with quite a few writers as well as university and academic people. Their attitude toward me could only be characterized as one of friendship, kindness, and broad smiles.

But at the same time I was offended by things which I saw which both upset and annoyed me. I will limit myself to mentioning only one of these things.

During my visits to the University of 'Ayn Shams, which was set up on the basis of being a modern university in accordance with the desires of the great Egyptian writer Taha Husayn, I noticed, when I was wandering around the bookstore, that there were many books which had titles which were anti-Semitic, and not merely anti-Zionist. I did not criticize the local authorities because there were such books in the university bookstore. But I was really surprised when I discovered that these books were published and sold in Egypt without anybody raising objections or being concerned, that such books are sold all over Egypt, that they are sold freely, that no one censors them, and that their sale and distribution have not lead to any counteraction taken by the political authorities.

This criticism is not directed at leading writers in Egypt such as Tawfiq al-Hakim and Najib Mahfuz who really have contributed toward achieving a rapprochement between the Jews and the Egyptians and who, in their writings, do not discriminate between Jews and non-Jews. They, like other writers and men of letters, have welcomed the idea of peace and have encouraged the steps taken toward it. My criticism is directed toward political institutions which have not undertaken any effort to prevent the distribution of such books in Egypt and which, in my opinion, are undermining mutual understanding between the two peoples.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

I talked with a prominent publisher in Cairo about my intention to publish translations and translated texts from French literature as published. He quickly replied that he would be happy to publish such works, but that Egyptian publishing houses nowadays were having a hard time and were going through a great crisis, basically because the other Arab countries were boycotting them. He said that publishing translations from Israeli literature would only increase the troubles and the crisis which Egyptian publishing houses were suffering from.

Dr Butrus Ghali I knew very well that it would not be easy for members of our cultural elite to come here. How are they supposed to feel if they come to Israel and, while they are in Israel, they see two Arab mayors from the West Bank being sent into exile?

So they avoided getting mixed up in this, and they refused to have their names associated with the visitors so that they would not feel any embarrassment or shame. This is why we could not get them to come.

The extremists that are talked about in the Egyptian press are also found in Israel as published. We also have our "Gush Emunim." As we know, extremism only produces more extremism. But extremists are only part of society. They represent only one element in the total picture.

Prof Chaim Ben Shahr It occurs to me that this discussion of ours is serving to point out the fact that this university harbors a wide variety of opinions and ideas. This is something which encourages and unites us. Consequently we hope that we will be able to meet with our Egyptian colleagues in their own country and that our discussions with them will be characterized by a high-level academic and scientific atmosphere.

I am glad that we have been able to open this channel of contacts and meetings between us, and I feel that it will serve to anchor a new tradition in relations between our two countries. The important thing in all of this is that we continue this dialogue and that we continue our efforts to understand each other.

It is our duty to confront the factors of instability in our present situation. The reason for this is that the peace process, if it fails, not only means the fall and failure of Sadat and the political leaders. It also means the fall and failure of our intellectuals and our two peoples, in equal measure, both here and in Egypt.

COPYRIGHT: 1981 AL-WATAN AL'-ARABI

9468

CSO: 4304/65

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

STEPPED UP TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT URGED

Paris AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI in Arabic No 228, 2 Jul 81 p 102

/Article by Nabil Maghribi: "Technology"7

/Text7 The Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor once again bring home the fact that technology is one of the major challenges which we will be facing in the future. Technological progress will be the weapon of tomorrow, and our battle is basically a battle against our backwardness and decline in the fields of science. Although various Arab countries emphasize this fundamental truth in public speeches and on the radio, the fact is that words are one thing and deeds are quite another. What have we done in practice to bring about a climate of scientific endeavor, encourage research, and urge our young people to pursue the path of technological specialization?

A quick review of the educational and scientific plans made in many of the Arab countries shows us that technology has not yet become a matter of concern, to the degree that is necessary--or a matter of primary concern--in connection with the endeavors of Arab government authorities.

In fact, there are numerous indications which show that a number of Arab countries still do not believe in the importance of technological development as an effective weapon against backwardness in all its forms. There are no huge budgets for the encouragement of scientific specialization, there are no real institutes of research, there are no appropriations provided to support work done by researchers, and there is no guidance for our young people.

And that is not all.

Arab universities are full of thousands of young people who are after a degree--any degree--in the theoretical "sciences," such as literature, psychology, sociology, etc. There are many reasons why they are seeking such degrees. They include, for example, lack of guidance, lack of specialized technical institutes, and the difficulty in registering and being accepted in schools and departments which provide technical education. For example, there are many formidable and subjective barriers and conditions which confront a candidate for entry into a medical school. This causes an enthusiastic young person to become disappointed and to then accept the reality of his situation and pursue a degree in either literature or political science or to attend a teachers' institute.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

It would be nice if this were the only problem. But, in addition to this, there is a very limited number of scholarships for specialization in technical fields. Or else such scholarships are distributed on the basis of personal recommendations, family ties, and influence rather than on the basis of using capability, excellence, and talent as the single criterion for distribution of the scholarships and for deciding which university students are to go abroad in order to continue their higher education and research. This problem becomes even more painful when an Arab scientist or researcher returns to his own country and finds that the doors are closed in his face. There is no position open for him, or else the salary is not attractive. There are only two choices which he then has. He can either accept some sort of job which is not at all related to his specialty or he can emigrate to some other country in God's wide world.

All of this is true at a time when we are not lacking in money or in potential, and when there is an urgent need for scientists in specialized fields and for a ray of hope that they will come forth with some discovery or invention.

In view of all of this, people are asking: Why are the Arabs lacking in original creativity? Why are we not making any discoveries or investing anything as the other peoples of the world are doing?

The answer to these questions is quite simple. Creativity is the result of an existing scientific and cultural climate and is the result of talent being provided with encouragement. In our countries there are those who kill talent or shackle it in its embryonic stages. There are those who prefer to open supermarkets rather than to open institutes for research. There are those who prefer to see an illiterate man in a prominent position rather than a man who is noted for his capability and his distinction. And there are many people who prefer to gamble away a million dollars playing roulette in "specialized" casinos abroad rather than to contribute a thousand dollars to a poor student who has been forced to quit his studies and devote himself to helping to support his family.

Yes, the matter is a very simple one. Our battle in the future will be the battle of science and development. Many Arab government organizations are aware of the importance of this, but many other Arab government organizations are still a long way away from realizing this and are still swimming against the current.

COPYRIGHT: 1981 AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI

9468

CSO: 4304/65

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

AFGHANISTAN

'MATCH' CITES SOVIET TROOPS QUANDARY

Paris PARIS MATCH in French No 1677, 17 Jul 81 pp 66-67

[Article by Patrick Forestier]

[Text] "I do not know when you will come back to the house. All day, the mother watches the television and listens to the radio for news. One day when it was raining heavily, they brought back Victor's body. He had only been married 2 weeks to Nadia. Poor Nadia. She is so unhappy. Come back quickly, my love. I love you, I love you."

"Today, the mujahedin attacked us. We were driven back. It is very cold and I still do not know when I will be able to come home."

"We have had even worse luck than before. Three of my comrades are dead. The mujahedin were on horses."

Words of love, words of anguish. Fear and dislike of the country also grip the Soviet soldiers fighting in Afghanistan. Destroying villages, killing women and children, the Nicolaevitches, the Grigoris and Leonids fully realize that they did not come to Afghanistan to defend that country against "imperialist attacks." Instead of Chinese, American and Egyptian "mercenaries" who want to overthrow the socialist regime of Babrak Karmal, they find their only adversaries are poor peasants armed with old rifles. Despite the party propaganda which continues to shower them with kind words, the young Soviets have low morale. They do not understand why they are dying in a foreign country. Every day, they realize more that the communist regime in Kabul is not only unpopular, but is detested and opposed by 99 percent of the people, contrary to what they had been told before they started. The mujahedin are not a few isolated "bands of plunderers," but are actually millions of patriots in resistance.

At the headquarters of the six Afghan resistance parties in Peshawar, on the Pakistani border, I clearly sensed this confusion in the letters the mujahedin recovered on the bodies of Red Army soldiers. I very clearly felt, on reading these simple words, that for young Soviets aged 18 to 20 Afghanistan is their Vietnam. While some may value the war in its own right, posing in photos with chests thrown out and a Kalatchnikov slung across their backs, most of them dread being sent for a year to that hell. They know that many will not come back. They know that throughout the Soviet Union, bodies are being discreetly returned to their families so as not

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

to upset public opinion. Even with a muzzled press, information gets around. And the longer the war drags on, the greater is the number of homes that have lost a son, a brother, or a husband. It is even said that following the big offensives when Soviet losses are sometimes significant, the bodies are stockpiled in order to stretch out over time their repatriation to the USSR. Some are supposedly buried in Afghanistan. Families may not learn of the disappearance of their son for weeks, or even months, as if Moscow were ashamed of these deaths.

As a general rule, the Soviets do not abandon their dead on the field. They try by any means to recover them after an attack.

"I have seen 'Shouravis' [Soviets] stick hooks into the lifeless bodies of their comrades so the helicopters can pick them up far away," I was told in graphic detail by Najjibulah, a mujahedin from Wardak. "Along with the helicopters, they had left commandos in the mountains, thinking to surprise us. When they came under our fire, many were hit. The armored helicopters picked up the dead on the end of a rope, while we continued to fire. They preferred to see them cut up on the rocks than to leave them on the field, after the battle. We found pieces of clothing, helmets, trails of blood, pieces of flesh over hundreds of meters."

The Soviets, however, are not always able to evacuate their dead. The mujahedin thus capture all sorts of documents, passports, military identity cards, personal photographs, letters sent by families in far-off Russia. In his military papers, one has slipped the photograph of his mother or fiancée, another the photo of his wife and son aged two or three. One will keep next to his heart the postcard of his beloved who wishes him a happy 20th anniversary. Another will have the photograph of his brother, in uniform, who had the good luck to be posted in the navy. And yet another will keep his own photograph, as a talisman, at the handlebars of the motorcycle of his dreams. A few days before dying, he showed it proudly, like all adolescents the world over, to his buddies in the regiment. The mujahedin do not get sentimental over such small things. The Jihad (holy war) has begun, and they are pitiless toward the communist infidels who are slaughtering their brothers. They laugh when they find instructions from the Soviet general staff for soldiers who find themselves captured by "revels:" "Get on your knees and say, 'Ma musulman assan' (I am Muslim) and 'Allah Akbar' (God is great)." Up to now, those instructions have not served much purpose. Rather than be captured, soldiers of the Red Army prefer to kill themselves. They know what will be their fate if they are taken. At best, they will be shot. At worst, they will be lynched or succumb to torture before their bloodied bodies are thrown into the field for the dread Afghan mastiffs.

"I know very well that it is horrible," I am told by Achmat, a chief from Paktia who attended the French school Istiqlal in Kabul. "But one must also understand the anger of the people. Most of them have lost their home, their father, two or three brothers in the same family. For these peasants, these rude mountain men, hatred has wiped out compassion."

The mujahedin smile when they find on a soldier one of those photocopies doubtless distributed to all units involved in the Soviet intervention in the country. They regard with amusement the three portraits of "representative types" showing the Khalki or Parchami (Afghans in the communist party) with his moustache, the mujahedin with his turban and beard, and the Soviet soldier with his helmet. With the help of these drawings, they are supposed to be able to tell a good Afghan from a bad.



## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Since last summer, the Soviets have been sparing their infantry. They prefer to intervene with armor and air power. They are pushing the Afghan army ahead, or at least what still remains of it. Out of nearly 80,000 men, half have deserted with weapons and equipment to join the resistance. These desertions are also affecting the Red Army. When the intervention began, in 1979, a good portion of the troops were natives of the Muslim socialist republics neighboring Afghanistan: Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, or Kirghizstan. The Soviets quickly found out their mistake. They grasped the danger posed by these soldiers who often spoke the same language and practiced the same religion as the Afghans. Most of the Soviet Muslims have been recalled. Among those who remain, Islam is sometimes stronger than ideology, and some do not hesitate to join up with their co-religionists.

And to set an example. I was able to procure a tract inspired by a Soviet Muslim soldier who went over to the Afghan resistance. The text of this appeal is in Arabic letters. The aim is to incite others of his ethnic group to join up with the mujahedin and become brothers-in-arms against the regime of Babrak Karmal: "I swear to you! It is the real truth. I am calling on the brothers in (Soviet) Central Asia who are presently given over to banitry in Afghanistan. "I want to ask you a question: who are those you are killing in Afghanistan? Brothers, I answer you myself: you do not know, because no one tells you the truth. No one."

They call the "mujahedin" (or partisans) "pasmach" (or bandits), but they are actually the local inhabitants who have taken up carbines to defend their Afghan fatherland.

"This 'Babrak bouc' (bouc, in Russian, is a pejorative term corresponding to 'swine') has told heaps of filthy lies (the Russian word is still more crude): that it is the bandits from America and Pakistan who are making war on you; but where are these bandits? I have never seen them. If they were American and Pakistani bandits, you would long ago have wiped them off the face of the earth. In saying that, I have in mind those who are presently in Afghanistan (the Soviets), so there are no Afghan bandits. "Several words about weapons. We now have (he identifies himself with the partisans) Soviet Papacha machineguns, TT pistols, anti-aircraft guns, old Soviet carbines, and all the rest.

"Brothers, you too would have defended you fatherland, hard as a rock. This is why I left and all the soldiers should leave Afghanistan with their units. For down there are Muslims, our brothers, our sisters, children, mothers. Has your Muslim brother in Afghanistan taken up arms against you?

"Brothers, I have not seen anything like that. When I was with you, I felt myself to be a friend of the Afghans that I met, and they explained to me that it was not "pasmach," but rather peaceful inhabitants who were firing on us. Because of the mistake of the Soviet Government, we took up arms and were killing the very people we had come to defend. These friends led me to the mujahedin, with whom I was able to talk. Following that discussion, it became apparent to me that the truth was that we had been the first to fire on these peaceful people. After which, I looked at everything our officers were saying, and the radio, and the "Bouc Babrak," and I saw that it was all lies. So I set out on the road of truth. These peaceful people opened my eyes. Whereas previously my eyes were shut; when the officers told me to go somewhere I went, and when they told me to do something, I did it...But now, I myself understand what must be done and what must not be done.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

"Brothers, understand the truth without being afraid of death, without fearing that you can be sent before the council of war. If one of you wants to contact me to negotiate or to follow the same path, hand in hand, he can find me at Koundiousi. If someone wants to pass me a word, it is enough to give the message to any inhabitant (of the village); this message will get to me." (There follows an illegible signature.)

In an office in the rundown house occupied by Harakat Inqelabe Islami Afghanistan in Peshawar, I saw for the first time the photo of this Soviet who has joined the mujahedin. He is named Brgibrigivech, but the moudjahiddins prefer to give him the Muslim name Taj Mohammed. Age 21, he was a truck driver in Kunduz. Kunduz, located 250 km from Kabul, is not far from the Amu Darya river, which is the border between Afghanistan and the USSR. The soldier named Brgibrigivech was born in the Soviet socialist republic of Kazakhstan, right next to the city of Djamboul, more precisely in the village of Logousky. At the end of last March, he deserted. He put on traditional Afghan garb to begin the Jihad under the command of the chief of the region, Mulaui Shaikh. Today, in the hills near Kunduz, he and his new companions harass his former comrades of times gone by who bear the stamp of the Red Star.

"I do not hide the fact that he was a choice recruit," confides Wallid, a former University of Kabul professor who sits on the political committee of Harakat Islami. "With his help, we have learned many things about the Soviets at Kunduz. His help has been very valuable to us."

At the headquarters of the various Afghan resistance parties in Peshawar, the military identity cards of Soviet soldiers are piling up. They no longer even arouse the curiosity of the leaders. How many young Russians die every day in Afghanistan? According to the London Institute of Strategic Studies, 15,000 were killed or wounded in 1980 out of an occupation force of 85,000 men. This is a very high percentage, one which well shows the fighting spirit of the Afghan resistance and the impotence of the Red Army in this guerrilla war.

"The mujahedin do not bring back the military card to Peshawar every time they kill a Chouravi," Wallid continues. "They do not bother with such details. They know that come what may they will fight as long as there remains a single Russian on Afghan territory."

COPYRIGHT: 1981 par Cogedipresse SA

9516  
CSO: 4619/22

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

ALGERIA

FLN PARTY POSITIONS FOLLOWING MEETING OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Paris MARCHES TROPICAUX ET MEDITERRANEENS in French No 1863, 24 Jul 81 p 1915

[Article]

[Text] The fifth meeting of the FLN [National Liberation Front] (30 June-2 July) more than previous ones, marks changes in Algeria's political evolution (Cf MTM of 10 July p 1817). With the shunting aside of several previously important political types whose political role had become practically nil, President Chadli Bendjedid has succeeded in asserting his authority, to such a degree that it was possible to write that now marks "the real debut of the post-Boumedienne era." More, it gives a strong signal that reform and clean-up efforts will be pursued without regard to rank or the prior service of individuals implicated. Thus the chief of state is seen by public opinion in his country as governing in the full sense of the word. For the time being, he does not believe he has anything further to fear in terms of being outflanked by an extremism that had its roots in youth and the trade unions.

If the former officials suspended by the central committee seem vulnerable to eventual prosecution for diversion of state funds, the case of two of them, Ahmed Bencherif and Mohammed Tayebi Larbi, is also significant in a different way: both were supposed to have had a share in responsibility for the mediocre success of the agrarian revolution. Well, salvaging Algerian agriculture is very much on the front burner.

The Agrarian Revolution Should Have Been Better Served and Better Led

Valued by President Boumedienne for his solid French military training, Col Ahmed Bencherif was placed at the head of the police, the "Darak al Watani," at the time of independence; in spite of the rules requiring turnover in military positions, he commanded it for 15 years, and was able to endow it with considerable quality and effectiveness. But it seems that, in concert with his father, the onetime "bachagha" at Djelfa and a big landowner, he was not unconnected to the failure of the project launched by the FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] aimed at creating a pilot zone for development of the steppes in the region. The abandonment of this enterprise, which would have provided much useful information to Algeria, delayed by several years the development of plans to improve the south, and thus the third phase, even now barely begun, of the agrarian revolution.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Former Agriculture Minister Mohammed Tayebi Larbi once enjoyed the gratitude of President Boumedienne for having accepted this thankless position in 1968. As an agricultural operator in the Bel Abbes region, Tayebi Larbi had some significant experience behind him; but, faithful to the socialist option chosen by Algeria, he refrained from resurrecting the policy of aid to the private sector which his predecessor, Mr Mahsas, had tried to implement; several months after he assumed his duties, he was a loyal spokesman for the agrarian revolution. Nevertheless, he was not successful, either in maintaining enthusiasm that had accompanied the launching of this enormous enterprise, or in keeping control of it against the incursions of other departments, or even in imposing on the cooperative system the conditions for his own effectiveness. The inclusion of Ahmed Bencherif and Mohammed Tayebi Larbi, early in 1979, in the FLN's Politburo, where they were to remain for only a year and a half, was doubtless intended to hide from the eyes of those loyal to the deceased president, the political eclipse of those two personalities. Today the Politburo, rid of Abdelaziz Bouteflika and Mohammed Salah Yahiaoui, who apparently were kept there so long only because of similar reasons, could once again play an active role as the permanent organ of the central committee; but nothing yet indicates that the president has made a decision in this regard.

Personal considerations again played a large role in the selection of the bureau in the fifth meeting of the central committee. Abdallah Demene Debbih, secretary general of the UGTA [General Union of Algerian Workers], and Mouloud Kassem and Moustafa Lachraf, former ministers, named to sit on it, were doubtless to reassure, respectively, the trade unions, the Islamicists, and the poly-cultural, modern-oriented types.

## The Preparatory Report On Cultural Policy

President Chadli Benjedid, in opening the central committee meeting, adopted a resolutely optimistic tone, even with regard to finance and production. After a solid but short reference to implementation of the Charter, "the real criterion of activism," he dwelled on some length on cultural questions, noting the need to "preserve and enrich...popular dialects and arts...(as part of) the national patrimony," though not in opposition to the Arab language. He concluded by affirming the threefold attachment of the Algerian people "to the Arab language as well as to its culture and civilization, to Islam as a religion and an ideology, and to socialism as the means of achieving a better tomorrow."

In its general policy resolution, the central committee stressed "the great importance of the organic measures taken in a responsible and militant spirit" with a view toward the "preservation of the dignity of the people and the state" and toward "the establishment of institutions founded on integrity, sincerity, competence, commitment, and the safeguarding of the achievements of the people and protection of their wealth"; this "historic mission" must be carried out "far from anarchy and improvisation," by legal means.

The purge of economic, financial, and social enterprises is described as having already yielded positive results. The committee elsewhere expresses its pleasure at the various measures leading toward "greater effectiveness in the execution of day to day tasks" of the party and mass organizations, and at the "complete cohesion between party and state authorities." The activities of the coordination committees in the governorates and communes, and congresses of trade unions, are described in terms of the same increased will toward popular participation found in the party's organic framework.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Cultural policy, in the same document, is the subject of a great deal of general considerations, which refer to the report prepared on this subject without yet disclosing its contents. The resolution on cultural policy, adopted at this meeting, dwells at length on the importance of the matter; but it avoids any specifics on the burning questions such as Berber demands, which are not mentioned; it also refers to the preparatory report which will become the "basic document of reference" establishing the principles and the aims that will make it possible to establish "an authentic national culture." It seems, then, that the direction is toward fairly rigorous state planning, which could only lead to centralization, control, and uniformity. The publication of the report examined by the central committee should make it possible to assess this new political line. Nevertheless, if one looks at the nomination of Boualem Baki--minister of justice but formerly in charge of religious affairs and highly regarded by the entire traditional sector--as a new member of the Politburo, one can only expect to see the Arab and Islamic orientation to which the head of state made firm reference accentuated.

More responsive to public opinion than the regime of President Boumedienne, the practice of President Bendjedid continues in effect to involve his characteristic scattering of both the measures he decides and the information he releases.

COPYRIGHT: Rene Moreux et Cie Paris 1981.

9516

CSO: 4519/35

IRAN

BANI-SADR GIVES REASONS FOR FLIGHT

PM111206 Paris PARIS MATCH in French 14 Aug 81 p 68-69

[Report on conversation with former Iranian President Abolhasan Bani-Sadr by Jean-Michel Caradec'h in Cachan, France: "I Will Restore Democracy in Iran"--date not given]

[Text] "Nobody knew that Khomeyni was capable of having 8-year old children executed. They know now!" Abolhasan Bani-Sadr, wearing a suit and sitting on a modern sofa, momentarily broke the "obligation to show reserve" imposed by the French Government in exchange for political asylum. The force of the comment brought a short-lived silence to the living room of the small apartment in Cachan, interrupting the whispered conversations of around half a dozen Iranian students. The former president's staff were busy composing pamphlets and documents in Persian which were energetically discussed by two young women, their heads covered with the Islamic veil. Bani-Sadr's daughters, though, have kept up the Western custom of wearing eye makeup. In the kitchen of the tiny apartment, the president's sister was making tea in silence. The telephone was virtually silent; I was told that it "is not very safe" and that most contacts with the outside world are made by message. Bani-Sadr, alone amid this rather artificial activity, has taken refuge behind a shuttered window under the fixed gaze of dozens of photographs showing the president when he was in office. Without his mustache Bani-Sadr looks younger--an impression countered by his fuller, stooping figure, and especially by the dullness of his tired eyes behind his tortoiseshell spectacles. Speaking in a faint, tired voice, as if reciting a monologue, Bani-Sadr explained: "We are going to install a democratic regime in Iran. I am busy drawing up a 15-point manifesto to be signed by the political parties and prominent people who wish to join me. We are making provision for the promulgation of new laws and the installation of an authentic regime which will once again take up the revolution's objectives of freedom, independence and social change." It is an extensive program. Moreover the president himself did not seem to believe in it when he tried to explain the good reasons which led him to leave Iran. The main and most convincing reason was the inability of the Mojahedin-e Khalq, the best-organized leftwing group in Iran from the military and political viewpoints, to guarantee his safety. "A large proportion of the militants were mobilized for my protection. You cannot imagine how many militants it takes to monitor the district where I remained hidden for 2 months. They had to be everywhere, to watch every building and every intersection. Some infiltrated decision-making bodies to find out the state of the search for me. The fact that I escaped from Iran in a military airplane from the international airport demonstrated our strength and their weakness."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

However, this cooperation between the Mojahedin and a section of the military, shown in practice by the former president's spectacular escape, is more like a propaganda operation for the Mojahedin than a personal exploit by the former president. This is certainly the feeling which emerges when you listen to Bani-Sadr, who is more anxious to justify his past than to look to his future. "People tried to use me as an intellectual shield. I wanted to play the role of effecting the necessary change in Iran. They rigged the election; I protested. They undermined the freedom of the press; I opposed them. I constantly opposed them. Right from the start I protested against the execution of members of the former regime." In fact he was drawing up the record of his failure. He became more vehement when it came to attacking Ayatollah Khomeyni, whose name the president avoided mentioning: "For the first time in the whole history of revolutions throughout the world, I succeeded in changing the public's opinion of its own leaders and institutions. The people now in power in Iran are hated and discredited thanks to my explanations and activity on television and at meetings. The recent election proves this: it is a failure for Khomeyni; almost nobody voted, and they stuffed the ballot boxes full. Until the 24 July election I believed that Khomeyni was too strong and that, in the event of confrontation with him, the people would follow him. Now I am convinced that the reverse is true; the almost complete abstention in the presidential election proves that."

The demonstration is not crystal clear. Millions of Iranians did not vote on 24 July, despite Khomeyni's solemn appeal describing participation in the elections as a "religious duty." But all the indications are that this was a rejection of all the Islamic revolution's institutions, including former President Bani-Sadr, "that mullah's son!" as some people openly called him when he was in power and had undertaken to remove the Kurdish "problem" in these terms: "I ask the soldiers not to take off their boots until they have finished with the Kurds." There was no question then of freedom, democracy or social progress: the repression against the Kurds had never been so violent. Since then Bani-Sadr has taken off his boots, and it was in white socks, under the protection of a company of the republican security corps, that he tried to justify what precipitated his fall: The deadlock in the war with Iraq. "When I left the military situation was the best to date." Nonetheless the result was poor. The personal prestige he could have obtained from the liberation of Iranian territory sank in the mud of Khorramshahr. It even turned against him, giving rise to suspicions of nonpartism. Bani-Sadr's inevitable decline began when Khomeyni noticed that his former private secretary was forgetting that it was he, Khomeyni, who was the real president of the Islamic republic. "The best of a bad lot," as one Iranian journalist described him, had nonetheless aroused some hope, and this is still Bani-Sadr's value today. The Mojahedin realized this when they took up the former president, now without a spiritual father, and placed him under the protection to use the final rays of his prestige for their benefit. This was a clever political operation which has enabled the leftwing Muslim group to reach an international audience, to associate their organization with the memory of Bani-Sadr in Iran and to prepare for taking over, for the post-Khomeyni period. "It will be easier if Khomeyni is alive," Mr Bani-Sadr said paradoxically. "Once he sees an irresistible social force rise against him, he will give in." When you look at that frail silhouette, you are tempted not to believe that. Nonetheless, the untiring propagandist of Khomeyni's thought once deceived his audience by organizing the Neauphle-le-Chateau exile's triumphant return to his country. Could he possibly do the same for

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

himself? The future will tell, but the presence of the powerful Mojahedin-e Khalq organization behind him leaves all possibilities open. This strongly organized group operates in complete secrecy, hitherto its actions had been carried out in secret. It was they who led the defenders of Khorramshahr City in successfully containing the Iranian tanks' advance with light weapons and proving the level of preparation among these militants, drawn mainly from student and intellectual circles. The Mojahedin's exploits do not end there. It is now known that several members have infiltrated the Islamic Republic Party at high level. It is probable that it was one of their members who succeeded in placing the bomb in the heart of the Islamic headquarters, decimating the Orthodox clergy leadership. President Bani-Sadr's flight also demonstrated that Mojahedin have been secretly planted in the armed forces. Colonel Mo'ezzi, who organized the escape, has admitted that he is a secret member of that organization. Another member of the crew also proved to be a Mojahed. Finally the organization apparently wanted to test its audience and influence by calling for a gigantic demonstration in support of the president when he was ousted. Khomeyni was to have machineguns used against the crowds: the Orthodox government was not deceived and threw the full weight of repression against the Mojahedin, executing almost 300 of them and imprisoning several thousand.

Mojahedin leader Mas'ud Rajavi fled with President Bani-Sadr. He is already putting himself forward as his prime minister.

COPYRIGHT: [1981] par Cogedipresse S.A.

CSO: 4619/30



FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

IRAN

BANI-SADR CLAIMS SUPPORT OF 90 PERCENT OF ARMED FORCES

LD090854 London THE OBSERVER in English 9 Aug 81 p 12

[Article by Jamal Rasheed in Paris]

[Text] Iran's former President Bani-Sadr, comfortably settled in a neat villa in a small village outside Paris, claims that 90 percent of the country's armed forces support him.

Massoud Rajavi, leader of the Mojahedin-e Khalq guerrilla group and perhaps Iran's second most wanted man, was close by during a 5-hour conversation I had with the former president, and so were three senior air force officers who secretly flew the pair out of Tehran last month.

Bani-Sadr accused Ayatollah Khomeyni of going back on his word and vowed that he would fight the Tehran regime through a broad political front standing for 'independence, freedom and Islam.'

The front--or National Council of Resistance--had already been set up with Rajavi as its coordinator, he said.

Bani-Sadr, who is growing again the famous moustache he shaved off to disguise his hurried departure from Tehran, said the Iranian Army had not moved in his support because he had held the men back, insisting that they finish the Iran-Iraq war before coordinating their activities with the Resistance Council. He agreed to the interview on condition that he wasn't directly quoted.

He said he had helped to raise the Iranian people's political consciousness so that they could now differentiate between religious despotism and true Islam.

He does not believe in military coups, but would create the kind of mass unity against the present regime which existed during the shah's last days.

Bani-Sadr admitted that his failure to create a political party after he became president was one reason for his dismissal, but he was counting on a people's movement which he now had in his alliance with the Mojahedin.

On the surface, Rajavi, rather than Bani-Sadr, would seem to hold most of the cards now, with a political organisation inside the country, support in the army, and

an independent armed guerrilla force which some opposition members claim ranges from 70,000 to 100,000 men. Most of the weapons were captured during the breakdown of the shah's regime or brought on the black market. With the splintering of the traditional left, the Mojahedin would appear to present the strongest opposition to the mullahs in Tehran.

Both leaders said they were in close touch with the minorities in Iran, especially the Kurdish Democratic Party. Bani-Sadr said he believed fully in giving the ethnic minorities full autonomy within the framework of Iran.

Bani-Sadr claimed that the conflict with Khomeyni began over the issue of including opposition parties in the Revolutionary Council. Khomeyni demanded that Bani-Sadr abolish all opposition parties, which the former president refused to do, believing in a multiparty system within an Islamic state.

Bani-Sadr said he had spent 20 years trying to create unity between the intellectuals and the clergy, but Khomeyni was responsible for ruining this effort by going back on everything agreed between them during their joint stay in Paris when resisting the shah.

The alliance between the Paris-based intellectual Bani-Sadr and the guerrilla leader Rajavi is based on building an Islamic society in Iran as a community of people without contradictions. This concept of tawhid, Persian for 'unity,' can now be achieved only by violent overthrow of the present regime.

Bani-Sadr said he learnt a great deal by reading Mojahedin literature while underground with Rajavi in Tehran. Both seemed to have arrived at a compromise struggle, involving the army, but only at the right time.

Rajavi has spent most of his 36 years underground and in the shah's prison. He said the Mojahedin now has 7,000 prisoners in Iranian jails and more than 300 members have been executed with their families in the past 3 weeks.

COPYRIGHT: The Observer Ltd [1981]

CSO: 4600/123

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

IRAN

FORMER ENVOY RAJAVI VIEWS IRANIAN SITUATION

PM311130 Paris LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR in French 25-31 Jul 81 p 37

[Interview with Qasem Rajavi, exiled elder brother of Mojahedin-e Khalq leader Mas'ud Rajaavi by Kenize Mourad: "Khomeyni in Deadlock"--date and place not given]

[Text] LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR: The Mojahedin have been subjected to fierce repression for a few weeks. Are they going to allow themselves to be eliminated or will they react by trying to organize an armed struggle?

Qasem Rajavi: The organization has a strong clandestine structure and is not in imminent danger of elimination. That is all just propaganda aimed at discouraging the population, who view the Mojahedin's resistance as their last hope. Unfortunately, it is true that hundreds have been executed. Most of them are supporters, not militants, since the latter have all simply gone back underground and are only carrying out isolated actions in small groups of four or five, for obvious safety reasons.

Hitherto, the Mojahedin have tried to avoid civil war. Even now they are not calling for armed struggle because there would be a bloodbath. Indeed, a section of the lumpenproletariat and the peasants is still loyal to Khomeyni today. There is no question of fighting against them.

LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR: What if Khomeyni lives another 10 years?

Qasem Rajavi: He has made the enormous mistake of sacking Bani-Sadr. The former president acted as a safety barrier. Today the government is now making an increasing number of mistakes both at the economic and political level. In a few months' time Iran will be in complete deadlock. If Khomeyni is still alive he will have the sad privilege of seeing even bigger crowds taking to the streets than did to protest the shah.

LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR: What if Khomeyni dies?

Qasem Rajavi: Nobody will then be able to hold back the population. Neither Raja'i nor Nabavi will be able to do so. None of the present leaders has any charisma. The regime will be swept away in 2 days. But there will be violence because Iran's new masters and their "thugs" are hated; they know that they cannot hope for any mercy. Therefore, there will be no alternative but to fight to the death.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR: The Mojahedin, like Khomeyni, are convinced of the need for an Islamic revolution. Why have they never been able to reach agreement on a minimum program?

Qasem Rajavi: Because Khomeyni has always refused to so much as to meet with them. Indeed they do not recognize the principle of "imamship," according to which the imam--at present Khomeyni--is in a way God's representative on earth. In addition, they refused to hand over their weapons because Beheshti's militia tried to kill them immediately after the revolution.

LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR: But above all Khomeyni claims that the Mojahedin are in fact Marxists. What do you think of that?

Qasem Rajavi: What does Khomeyni know about Marxism? I heard him explain the difference between Islam and Marxism as follows: "In 1944, when Stalin visited Iran, he brought his cow in the airplane because Iranian milk was not good enough for him. Our imam 'Ali, on the other hand, who governed in the 7th century, never owned more than one shirt. When he was given a second one he gave it to the first beggar he met." If you take Marxism to be a method of investigation, perhaps the Mojahedin are Marxists. But in that case they would be Marxists who believe in God and who are fighting to defend Islam's deep values, which are the values of all the great monotheistic religions. In practice, they want economic and social justice and know that it is necessary to struggle to achieve it. One of my brother's bedtime books in his young days was Frantz Fanon's "Les Damnés de la Terre." Is that Marxist or Islamic? In any case it is a cry of revolt on behalf of all oppressed people.

COPYRIGHT: [1981] "Le Nouvel Observateur"

CSO: 4619/30

END

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY